

REMARKS

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

The text of the previous rejection is incorporated herein by reference. The rejection of claims 14 & 15 are hereby incorporated into the rejection of claim 12. This reflects the cancellation of these claims and addition of their limitations into claim 12.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 15 May 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As in the previous response, Applicant argues (repeatedly) that Okuniewicz teaches a bonus that is randomly generated based on an event that takes place on the slot machine and upon which the player is unaware. This argument is based on an incorrect reading of the reference. Okuniewicz makes it clear that the result of the bonus (i.e., the result of the lottery) is the random bonus. (Col 1, 55-60) There is no suggestion in Okuniewicz that the dispensing of the ticket must be random. In fact, since Okuniewicz teaches that the tickets may regularly be awarded based on amounts wagered, it is clear that Okuniewicz contemplates at least one embodiment in which the award of the ticket is not random.

The claims of the present invention clearly state that the number of coins needed to generate a ticket is shown to the player. Further, the player is shown how many coins have been placed into the machine and therefore, knows exactly

how many coins are needed to be placed into the machine in order to generate a ticket. Okuniewicz clearly teaches that a secondary bonus such as a lottery ticket is given in response to particular reel combinations or particular events occurring on the slot machine board or even placing in a preset amount of coin. However, Okuniewicz clearly does not teach showing the amount of coins that are needed to generate a ticket, or showing the amount of coins being placed into the machine. The present invention teaches that even after a user places the coins into the machine and plays the game, those coins are continually counted until a player reaches the coins necessary to generate a ticket. Once a player has generated a ticket, the counter is reset. This is not taught by Okuniewicz. And in fact, Okuniewicz teaches against this and wishes the player to continue playing the machine so that randomly the ticket is generated. By the teachings of Okuniewicz a player would continue playing and if a certain combination of reels are met, or a certain number of coins are placed in, a bonus is generated. The Examiner believes that a player can count how many coins are placed in and count how many coins are needed to generate the ticket. However, since the player would not know how many coins were placed in previously over Okuniewicz, they could not determine how many coins are needed to generate the ticket.

Applicant argues that there is no reason to combine Okuniewicz and Quinn. This argument is based on Applicant's erroneous interpretation of the Okuniewicz reference.

Applicant argues that Okuniewicz does not teach showing the player when a ticket will be generated. Again, this was answered in the previous office action. For over 100 years, slot machine operators have been notifying players when they may expect a payout or a prize. This is called a payable. They are conspicuously posted on the slot machine. Paytables are so well known that it is not considered necessary to mention the display of one in every slot machine patent – if they are not inherent, they are virtually inherent.

Okuniewicz does not want to show a player when the ticket will be generated. The reasoning behind this patent is that the tickets are generated based on an event which is not known to the user. Therefore, Okuniewicz would not teach the numeric counter counting the coins until the ticket is generated, or the amount of coins necessary to generate the ticket.

Again, Applicant is basing his arguments on a faulty interpretation of Okuniewicz. Anyone who plays Okuniewicz's machine for any length of time will not be surprised when it dispenses the lottery ticket – even if no tickets are mentioned on the payable. Okuniewicz teaches dispensing lottery tickets regularly i.e., upon the insertion of a certain number of coins) or as a result of certain combinations on the reels. Players would soon figure this pattern out. (Player: "Every time Orange-Lemon-Cherry come up, the machine dispenses a ticket – that means that Orange-Lemon-Cherry is a combination that awards a ticket..." Or, "Every time I put 20 coins into the machine, I get a ticket. I've put in 19 coins. This is 20. Yep, here's the ticket. Just as I expected...") In short,

there is absolutely no reason that Okuniewicz should not post the criteria for awarding a ticket on the payable – players (who usually know how to count and can often figure out cause and effect) would soon figure it out anyway. Plus posting the criteria would have benefits because doing so would let the player know that the tickets are available.

Again, the Examiner states that the person playing the machine could count the number of coins necessary to get a ticket. In applicant's invention, a player can go to a machine in which 14 coins have been placed into a slot machine and only place six more coins in to generate a ticket. In Okuniewicz one could not do this. Therefore the claims of the present invention are allowable.

Applicant believes that the application is now in condition for allowance.

"EXPRESS MAIL" Mailing Label No. 882413952 US
Date of Deposit: November 27, 2006
I hereby certify that this paper (and any document(s) attached herewith
is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail
Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 C.F.R. 1.10 on the
date indicated above and is addressed to the Commissioner
for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313 on
November 27, 2006

Signature:

Name:

Debbie Broderick

Respectfully submitted,



Philip M. Weiss

Reg. No. 34,751

Attorney for Applicant

Weiss & Weiss

300 Old Country Rd., Ste. 251

Garden City, NY 11530

(516) 739-1500